U.S. Patent Application No. 10/678,975 Attorney Docket No. 352003-991290 (Formerly 2102487-991290)

# REMARKS

Claims 2, 8, and 14 have been deemed allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. These claims have been so rewritten, and thus are now in allowable form.

# The Objections to the Specification

The Abstract and Specification have been amended as requested by Examiner, and now overcome Examiner's objections.

#### The Objections to Claim Informalities

The claims have been amended to correct informalities as requested by Examiner, and now overcome Examiner's objections.

## The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The claims have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, and now overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

## The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 9 has been amended to recite a recording medium, and instructions recorded thereon. Accordingly, claim 9 now overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

#### The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Application Publication No. 2001-273160 to Nozuyama ("Nozuyama 160") in view of Japanese Application Publication No. 2000-276500 to Nozuyama ("Nozuyama 500"), and in view of Japanese Patent No. JP401088266A to Sekine ("Sekine"). Applicant respectfully traverses, noting that none of these references discloses every element of the claims as amended. More specifically, none of these references discloses a weighting module or a data memory configured as claimed, nor any of their associated functions.

PA\10466223.1 352003- 99129014 U.S. Patent Application No. 10/678,975 Attorney Docket No. 352003-991290 (Formerly 2102487-991290)

As noted by Examiner, Nozuyama 160 does not disclose the claimed weighting module, or its function (Office Action, page 8). Furthermore, Examiner notes that Nozuyama 500 does not disclose a weighting reflecting a plurality of layout elements (Office Action, page 9). Accordingly, neither Nozuyama 160 nor Nozuyama 500 can disclose a weighting module configured to add weight reflecting a plurality of layout elements, and information on the names of the layout elements.

Sekine does not cure the defects in either Nozuyama reference. More specifically, while Sekine discloses adding weights, it does not disclose adding weights reflecting name information of layout elements. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is patentable over Nozuyama 160, Nozuyama 500, and Sekine for at least the reason that it recites a weighting module "configured to add weight reflecting a plurality of layout elements of the logic circuit and information on each name of the plurality of layout elements..." Likewise, claim 3 is patentable over these references for at least the reason that it recites "adding a weight reflecting a plurality of layout elements of the logic circuit and information on each name of the plurality of layout elements..." Similarly, claim 9 is patentable over these references for at least the reason that it recites instructions for adding "a weight reflecting a plurality of layout elements of the logic circuit and information on each name of the plurality of layout elements of the logic circuit and information on each name of the plurality of layout elements of the logic circuit and information on each name of the plurality of layout elements of the logic circuit and information on each name of the plurality of layout elements..."

In addition, none of Nozuyama 160, Nozuyama 500, or Sekine discloses the generation of weighted, undetected faults. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is patentable over these references for at least the additional reason that it recites "a data memory configured to store a plurality of final weighted undetected faults...." Similarly, claim 3 recites "listing a plurality of final weighted undetected faults...." and claim 9 recites instructions for directing a computer to "list a plurality of final weighted undetected faults...." Thus, claims 3 and 9 are also patentable over these references for at least this same additional reason. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9, and are thus also patentable for at least these same reasons.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/678,975 Attorney Docket No. 352003-991290 (Formerly 2102487-991290)

# **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-14 are now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

Dated: /

By

Jon Y. Ikegami

Attorney for Applicants

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP

2000 University Avenue East Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 833-2104